

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/691,649	<b>Applicant(s)</b> CHISHOLM ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Bradley Edelman	<b>Art Unit</b> 2153	

**All Participants:**
**Status of Application:** RCE

 (1) Bradley Edelman

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

 (2) Joseph Herndon

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 1 December 2004
**Time:** 3pm
**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☒ Yes ☐ No

 If Yes, provide a brief description: *see attached proposed amendment.*
**Part I.**
**Rejection(s) discussed:**
*potential 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph rejections*
**Claims discussed:**
*1, 19, 20*
**Prior art documents discussed:**
**Part II.**
**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**
*See Continuation Sheet*
**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Bradley Edelman  
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner suggested that Applicant amend claims to overcome potential 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph rejections regarding lack of antecedent basis and ambiguity in the claim language. Applicant agreed to the amendments entered in the attached Examiner's Amendment.